

## REMARKS

The Office Action of April 20, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

The present Amendment revises the claims to improve their form under US claim-drafting practice.

The present Amendment also revises claim 10 so that it now recites a computer readable medium that is encoded with instructions for performing the method that is recited. Since a computer readable medium is a physical structure that has a practical application, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection for non-statutory subject matter in sections 2-4 of the Office Action should be withdrawn. The present Amendment cancels claim 11 as being redundant in view of the revisions made to claim 10.

The present Amendment also cancels claim 7 and transfers its subject matter (in modified form) to independent claims 1 and 10. As a result, claim 1 now recites “means for detecting and displaying any mismatching part when alignments of the documents in at least three of the *n* languages of the documents have mismatched,” and claim 10 has a step that is similar. The display of contradictory or mismatching parts (for example when a sentence in a first language corresponds to a sentence in a second language and the sentence in the second language corresponds to a sentence in the third language, but the sentence in the first language does not correspond to the sentence in the third language because of the alignment result between the first and third languages – see the paragraph bridging pages 12 and 13 of the present application) is shown at step S28 in Figure 4 of the application’s drawings and at element 220 in Figure 3.

The Office Action rejects all of the claims for anticipation by the prior art that is acknowledged in the “Background” portion of the present application (hereafter the AAPA). It is respectfully submitted, though, that the inventions defined by independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the AAPA.


Section 12 of the Office Action takes the position that the AAPA includes means for displaying mismatching parts. Although a passage at page 3 of the application, lines 21 and 22, says that “... an operator needs to manually perform a check or make corrections

while watching the result of the alignment ..." in the AAPA, it is respectfully submitted that an ordinarily skilled person would not conclude from this statement that mismatching parts are specifically pointed out to the operator in the AAPA. Instead, an ordinarily skilled person would simply think that the statement, when considered in conjunction with the rest of the "Background" portion of the application, simply means that the AAPA required a lot of operator intervention.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the inventions defined by independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the AAPA. Since the remaining claims depend from claim 1 and recite additional limitations to further define the invention of claim 1, they are automatically patentable along with claim 1 and need not be further discussed.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Wood  
Registration No. 28,134  
Rabin & Berdo, P.C.  
Customer No. 23995  
(202) 326-0222 (telephone)  
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)

AW/ng